

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-21 were pending in this application. Claims 11-21 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 22-32 have been added. Applicant respectfully asserts that this amendment does not introduce new matter, and its entry is respectfully requested. After entry of the amendment, claims 1-10 and 22-32 will be pending in this case. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-4, 11-14, 17-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,467,011 to Hunt (“Hunt”). Applicants have canceled claims 11-14, 17-18 and 20, thereby rendering the rejections thereto moot. Further, Applicants have amendment claim 1 to overcome the rejection.

Hunt shows a system by which power line conductors are used to transmit signals to a receiver, which also is coupled to the power line conductors. Applicant respectfully submits that Hunt does not, however, teach or disclose “analysis means, wherein the received signal is analyzed to determine characteristics or features of the imperfectly-conducting medium” as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-10.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,207,568 to MacLeod (“MacLeod”).

Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby rendering the rejection thereto moot. Applicant respectfully submits that MacLeod does not teach or suggest “analysis means, wherein the received signal is analyzed to determine characteristics or features of the imperfectly-conducting medium” as recited in amended claim 1, and that therefore the combination of Hunt with MacLeod does not teach this element claim 2, which depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 2.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,285,742 to Haumann *et al.* Claims 16 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby rendering the rejection thereto moot.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action objects to claims 5-10, 15 and 21 as allowable, but dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 5-7 have been amended to more clearly recite particular features of the present invention and are believed to be patentable without objection. Claim 10 is believed patentable in view of the remarks above. Claims 15 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby rendering the objection thereto moot.

New claims 22-32 are believed patentable over the art of record and Applicant respectfully requests claims 22-32 be passed to allowance.

Serial No.: 10/014,414  
Art Unit: 2635

Attorney's Docket No.: VOR-101  
Page 10

In view of the foregoing all of the claims pending in this case (claims 1-10 and 22-32) are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: March 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

SCHAEFER

By:   
David C. Isaacson  
Registration No. 38,500

Attachments:

DCI/sc

Customer No. 28970